90-1311

No.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
FEB 14 1991
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

In The Supreme Court of the United States October Term, 1990

THEODORE SMITH,

Petitioner,

vs.

CITY OF CHICAGO,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

JULIE L. FRIEDMAN
53 West Jackson Boulevard
Suite 615
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 922-8980

Attorney for Petitioner
THEODORE SMITH

American Reprographics Management, Inc.™ (312) 332-ARMI

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. The Circuits Have Inconsistently Interpreted The Exception Coined By This Court In Carey v. Piphus As To Both Scope And Damages Resulting In Unintended, Illogical, And Unfair Consequences Which Defeat The Very Rationale Of The Exception.

2. This Court Should Clarify Whether A Plaintiff Who Cannot Prove Actual Compensatory Damages Flowing From An Officer's Overt Misrepresentations Is Still Entitled To An Award Of Punitive Damages.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

II. QUESTION PRESENTED i

III. TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

IV. OPINION BELOW 1

V. JURISDICTION 1

VI. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED 2

VII. STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2-6

VIII. REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT 6

1. The Circuits Have Inconsistently Interpreted The Exception Coined By This Court In Carey v. Piphus As To Both Scope And Damages Resulting In Unintended, Illogical, And Unfair Consequences Which Defeat The Very Rationale Of The Exception. 6-9

2. This Court Should Clarify Whether A Plaintiff Who Cannot Prove Actual Compensatory Damages Flowing From An Officer's Overt Misrepresentations Is Still Entitled To An Award Of Punitive Damages 9-10

IX. APPENDIX 1a-17a

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

Briggs v. Malley, 748 F.2d 715 (7th Cir. 1984) 7, 8

Brown v. Bullard Independent School District, 640 F.2d 651 (5th Cir. 1981) 10

Carey v. Piphus, 435 U.S. 247, 266-67, 98 S.Ct. 1042, 1054, 55 L.Ed.2d 252, 266 (1978) 6, 7, 9, 10

City of Evanston v. Regional Transportation Authority, 825 F.2d 1121 (7th Cir. 1987) 7

Farrar v. Cain, 756 F.2d 1148, 1152 (5th Cir. 1985) 10

Ganey v. Edwards, 759 F.2d 337, 339 (4th Cir. 1985) 10

Green v. McKaskle, 788 F.2d 1116 (5th Cir. 1986) 10

Jones v. City of Chicago, 856 F.2d 985 (7th Cir. 1988) 7

Kennedy v. Los Angeles Police Department, 901 F.2d 702 (9th Cir. 1989) 9

Madison County Jail Inmates v. Thompson, 773 F.2d 834, 844 (7th Cir. 1985) 10

Mansell v. Saunders, 372 F.2d 573 (5th Cir. 1967) 10

Mark v. Furay, 769 F.2d 1266 (7th Cir. 1985) 7

McCulloch v. Glasgow, 620 F.2d 47 (5th Cir. 1980) 10

McLaughlin v. Alban, 775 F.2d 389 (D.C. Cir. 1985) 7

Myers v. Morris, 810 F.2d 1437 (8th Cir. 1987) 7

Smiddy v. Varney, 665 F.2d 261 (9th Cir. 1981) 7

Smith v. City of Chicago, 913 F.2d 469 (7th Cir. 1990) 6, 8

Ustrak v. Fairman, 781 F.2d 573, 581 (7th Cir. 1986) 10

Whitley v. Seibel, 613 F.2d 682 (7th Cir. 1980) 8

No.

In The
Supreme Court of the United States
October Term, 1990

THEODORE SMITH,

Petitioner,

vs.

CITY OF CHICAGO,

Respondent.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

The Petitioner Theodore Smith respectfully prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the judgment and opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit entered in this proceeding on September 21, 1990.

OPINION BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit appears in the appendix hereto.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, affirming the district court's order dated February 22, 1989, was entered on the 21st day of September, 1990. A Petition for Rehearing was denied by the Seventh Circuit on November 16,

1990. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked pursuant to Title 28 United States Code Section 1254.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States appear in the appendix hereto.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

At 5:00 p.m. on April 25, 1968, a woman named Shirley Johnson reported to the Chicago Police Department that she had been raped. (Case Report, Exhibit 1 to Record Item No. 84) Johnson was taken to Billings Hospital, where a rape test was performed. Upon examination it was found that *no semen* was present nor was there *any* sign of bruising or trauma. (Case Report, Exhibit 1 to Record Item No. 84) Appendix at 15a.

On April 28, 1968, Detectives Springer and O'Connell approached Petitioner and informed him that Johnson had accused him of rape. These officers also told Petitioner that unless he paid them some money, he would be arrested and charged with having raped Johnson. (Smith Affidavit, Exhibit 2 to Record Item No. 84) Petitioner had had prior dealings with Springer and O'Connell; earlier in 1968, Petitioner had paid these officers $220 to have an alleged battery charge dropped. (Smith Affidavit, Exhibit 2 to Record Item No. 84)

On May 7, 1968, Petitioner informed Springer and O'Connell that he was not going to pay the bribe. (Smith Affidavit, Exhibit 2 to Record Item No. 84) The next day, May 8, 1968, thirteen days after the alleged incident, Shirley Johnson swore out a complaint against Petitioner and the officers arrested Petitioner. (Supplemental Report, Exhibit 3 to Record Item No. 84)

On July 18, 1968 Petitioner appeared before Judge Daniel J. Ryan on a probable cause hearing. Judge Ryan specifically noted that there was sperm. After the police officer testified that sperm was found, the judge exclaimed "There's no question about it" and made a finding of probable cause.

THE COURT: I think she saw the man and one time was in the room, *plus sperm* and the immediate complaint and certain conditions. What do you know about this?

MR. EGAN: The officer had a conversation with the same witness that he offered to bring in.

POLICE OFFICER: I talked to him, if he heard any disturbance, he said "No". I questioned him as to Theodore Smith and his words to me were that he's a nut, they've been trying to get rid of him in the building.

MR. EGAN: What was the result of the medical?

POLICE OFFICER: *There was sperm.*

THE COURT: There's no question about it. Normally they're out together, but here's an accosted woman on the street, she never knew him before.

MR. DEFENSE COUNSEL: Your Honor, may I –

THE COURT: I'll hold it over. You could save your defense for later. The same bond to stand.

(Transcript 7/18/68 p.15) Appendix at 12a-13a.

Before Petitioner's trial in state court, his attorney was informed for the first time that a test purportedly conducted by the Chicago Police Crime Lab resulting in a positive finding of semen. (Crime Lab Report, Exhibit 4 to Record Item No. 84) Documents produced before the trial stated that the test had been performed at the Chicago Police Department Crime Lab on a vaginal swab which had been picked up from Billings Hospital on April 25, 1968 by Evidence Technician Chilla. (Chilla Report, Exhibit 5 to Record Item No. 84) Chilla's report stated that he had obtained the swab at Billings Hospital from a clerk named "R. Brown." (Chilla Report, Exhibit 5 to Record Item No. 84)

Petitioner was convicted of rape.[1] At Petitioner's state court trial, the Chicago Crime Lab results (positive for semen) and the Billings Hospital report (negative for semen, negative for bruising or trauma of any kind) were admitted into evidence.

After he had served his term of imprisonment, Petitioner conducted his own investigation. He discovered that the only person working at Billings Hospital on the pertinent date with the name "R. Brown" had never given the rape test swab or anything else to Chilla. (Short Appendix 15).

In his pro se civil rights complaint filed on May 18, 1979 (Record Item No. 1), Petitioner alleged that in 1968 Defendants had fabricated a police report and a Chicago Police Crime Lab report which found evidence of semen, which report was used to deprive Petitioner of federal rights. Petitioner alleged that he had first discovered the fabrication of evidence in 1976 after his release from jail. (Record Item No. 1 at 6) Defendants moved to dismiss, arguing, inter alia, that the case was barred by the statute of limitations. (Record Item No. 10) In his memorandum of April 15, 1981, Judge Grady held that the statute of limitations defense raised by defendants could not be resolved without an expansion of the record. (Short Appendix 2-4) Thereafter, in opinion filed on June 23, 1981, Judge Grady concluded that because of the complexity of the issues, counsel should be appointed for Petitioner. (Short Appendix 7)

In his memorandum opinion of December 22, 1981, Judge Grady denied the motion to dismiss of the individual police officers, noting that Petitioner's claim against these officers "in a nutshell, is that the officer fabricated evidence that was used to arrest, charge and convict plaintiff of rape."[2] (Short Appendix 11) The individual defendants had argued that Petitioner's claim was barred by collateral estoppel because Petitioner had an opportunity to litigate the claim on direct appeal from his conviction. (Short Appendix 11) Judge Grady disagreed (Short Appendix 12):

---

[1] Petitioner's conviction was affirmed on direct appeal, *People v. Smith*, 8 Ill. App.3d 36, 288 N.E.2d 694 (1972).

[2] In the same order, the district court dismissed Petitioner's claims against the City of Chicago and former police superintendent Conlisk. (short Appendix 8-11)

> "Since plaintiff discovered the evidence after trial and appeal, he could not have litigated the issue at either of those proceeding. Moreover, where plaintiff's inability to fully and fairly litigate the issues of fabrication of evidence and perjury are due not merely to an alteration of circumstances beyond the parties' control, but to defendants' allegedly wrongful conduct, the application of collateral estoppel is especially inappropriate."

Following an evidentiary hearing on defendants' statute of limitations defense,[3] Judge Grady held that Petitioner's claims were not time barred. (Short Appendix 18) Petitioner filed an amended complaint (Record Item No. 68); shortly thereafter, defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. (Record Item No. 75)

In June of 1985, the case was transferred to Judge Williams. In a memorandum opinion dated February 6, 1987, Judge Williams denied the motion for summary judgment of defendants Springer, O'Connell and Chilla.[4] (Short Appendix 21-30) Thereafter, on Defendants' motion to reconsider, the district court held that because Petitioner had been released from custody, he could not maintain his damages action (Short Appendix 32-34)

On appeal, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals reversed, holding that Petitioner was not required to show that the fabricated evidence was the "but for" cause of his arrest or conviction:

> "Smith, therefore, can prevail is he shows that the defendants fabricated evidence leading to his false arrest and subsequent unreasonable seizure [citations omitted] causing him to suffer damages. Smith cannot be faulted for believing that without the fabricated evidence he would not have been incarcerated. The truth of this sentiment, however, is irrelevant to

---

[3] The parties agreed to waive a jury determination on the limitations defense. (Short Appendix 6 n.1)

[4] At the request of Petitioner, the district court dismissed all claims against defendant Calbresa, Kelly and Downey. (Short Appendix 30)

Smith's section 1983 claim." *Smith v. City of Chicago,* 859 F.2d at 43.

On remand, Petitioner stated his damages claim as follows (Pre-Trial Order, Record Item No. 131):

> "Plaintiff seeks compensation for the emotional distress and economic loss he suffered as a result of defendants' wrongful acts. Specifically, plaintiff seeks compensation at the rate of $300 for each day that he was incarcerated and $10,000 per year thereafter."

Following submission of the pre-trial order, defendants moved *in limine* for an order "precluding Plaintiff from seeking damages related to his conviction and incarceration." (Short Appendix 36-38) Defendants relied on the Seventh Circuit's statement that Petitioner was not seeking "relief related to his conviction," 859 F.2d at 35, and argued that Petitioner cannot therefore "seek damages related to that conviction." (Short Appendix 37) Petitioner opposed this motion (Record Item No. 140) but the district court accepted defendants' arguments that Petitioner was limited to seeking nominal damages. (Short Appendix 43). Appendix at 17a.

Petitioner appealed and on September 21, 1990, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the district court's judgment in favor of the Petitioner and the limitation of damages to the amount of $1.00. Appendix at 1a-10a. Petitioner filed a Petition for Rehearing which was denied on Nov. 16, 1990. Appendix at 11a.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. The Circuits Have Inconsistently Interpreted The Exception Coined By This Court In Carey v. Piphus Both as to Scope And Damages Resulting In Unintended, Illogical, And Unfair Consequences Which Defeat The Very Rationale Of The Exception.

The Seventh, Eighth, and Second circuits follow this court's ruling in *Carey v. Piphus,* 435 U.S. 247 (1978), that a constitutional deprivation would not allow the recovery of compensatory damages if the injured party could have or would have suffered

the same injury even if the alleged constitutional violation had not occurred. Based on *Carey*, the Seventh Circuit has held that the existence of *probable cause for an arrest* totally *precludes any section 1983 claim* for unlawful arrest, false imprisonment, or malicious prosecution, regardless of whether the defendants had malicious motives for arresting the plaintiff. *Mark v. Furay*, 769 F.2d 1266 (7th Cir. 1985)

However, the situation at bar falls within an exception that is recognized in *Carey*. The finding of probable cause by a judge cannot shield a police officer who *deliberately supplies misleading* information that *influences* the court's decision to issue a warrant. This exception has been applied, albeit inconsistently, in the First, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and DC circuits. *Briggs v. Malley*, 748 F.2d 715 (1st Cir. 1984); *Jones v. City of Chicago*, 856 F.2d 985 (7th Cir. 1988); *Myers v. Morris*, 810 F.2d 1437 (8th Cir. 1987); *Smiddy v. Varney*, 665 F.2d 261 (9th Cir. 1981); *McLaughlin v. Alban*, 775 F.2d 389 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

The evidence in the instant case can only be interpreted to suggest that the defendants intentionally misled and misrepresented the facts of the case to the trial court which found probable cause. The finding of probable cause was secured by representations which were considerably less than full and candid. It appears from the comments of the judge who found probable cause that had he been fully and honestly informed by the defendants and had not been misled, it is doubtful that the arrest would have been authorized. Here the judicial officer making the probable cause determination was deprived of facts that were vital to his determination of probable cause.

It is hornbook law that a police officer who is objectively reasonable in seeking a finding of probable cause based on *truthful* and *complete* information is shielded from liability. But this standard does not fit a situation where a police officer *knowingly* fabricates evidence and conceals facts that *would negate* probable cause. *City of Evanston v. Regional Transportation Authority*, 825 F.2d 1121 (7th Cir. 1987).

If an officer undertakes to make decisions which are not his to make and then *intentionally misleads* those who do have the ultimate authority to authorize the arrest, that officer will

be found to have deprived the arrestee of his liberty without due process of law. *Whitley v. Seibel,* 613 F.2d 682 (7th Cir. 1980).

Where an officer is "constitutionally negligent," that is, where the officer should have known that the facts recited in the affidavit did not constitute probable cause, liability will attach to his actions. *Briggs v. Malley,* 748 F.2d 715 (1st Cir. 1984).

Obviously a fabrication of evidence as in the case at bar in the course of an extortion attempt goes beyond the "should have known" standard in *Briggs.* If Petitioner would have been prosecuted even if the defendants had behaved properly, then they did not cause his injury and are not liable. *But* the evidence is that the defendants from the very origins of the investigation *fabricated evidence* in a bribery scheme, systematically *concealed from the court and misrepresented to it, facts highly material* to — that is, facts likely to influence — the decision whether to prosecute Petitioner and whether (that decision having been made) to continue prosecuting him right up to and into the trial. Indeed, Petitioner would never have been charged in the first place if the court had known the operative fact militating against his guilt, that upon refusal of his bribe the police officers fabricated evidence, and that the only rape test performed found no semen and no trauma.

On appeal, the Seventh Circuit agreed with the District Court that Defendants acted maliciously and violated Petitioners' rights, *yet* held that Petitioner was not entitled to anything other than $1.00 nominal damages. That court ruled that in order for a plaintiff in a section 1983 action to be entitled to any other damages for a violation of procedural due process, he must prove that the violation actually was the cause of his injury or deprivation. *Smith v. City of Chicago,* 913 F.2d 469 (7th Cir. 1990).

> "Thus, because probable cause existed for Smith's arrest and he would, thus, have been arrested in the absence of the defendants' alleged unconstitutional conduct, Smith has failed to suffer actual damages from the asserted constitutional deprivation, and his recovery was properly limited to nominal damages." *Smith, supra* at 474.

This ruling is inconsistent with the theory that liability attaches if the probable cause is based on a police officer's *intentional misrepresentation or concealment* of a material fact.

The denial of damages in such a case *completely nullifies* the force of a ruling that a defendant has acted in violation of one's constitutional rights. The rule cannot be enforced without an accompanying award of damages. Obviously, if officers acting in concert deliberately supply misleading and fabricated information in order to obtain a finding of probable cause for the purpose of extorting money, and a court finds this conduct to be in violation of an individual's constitutional rights, mere nominal damages are insufficient.

In order to settle the law and to give effect to the rule that an intentional misrepresentation in obtaining a finding of probable cause violates a defendant's constitutional rights, this Court must clarify what type of damages would be appropriate in such a situation.

Where this court has coined a wrong, it must provide a remedy for that wrong.

2. This Court Should Clarify Whether A Plaintiff Who Cannot Prove Actual Compensatory Damages Flowing From An Officer's Overt Misrepresentations Is Still Entitled To An Award Of Punitive Damages.

Punitive damages may be assessed in section 1983 actions "when the defendant's conduct is shown to be motivated by evil motive or intent, or when it involves reckless or callous indifference to the federally protected rights of others." *Kennedy v. Los Angeles Police Department*, 901 F.2d 702 (9th Cir. 1989); Smith v. Wade, 461 U.S. 30, 56 (1983).

This Court in *Carey v. Piphus* suggested that punitive damages might be awarded in a proper case under section 1983 with the specific purpose of deterring or punishing violations of constitutional rights. 435 U.S. at 257, n.11.

This suggestion has been followed in a number of circuits that hold that a plaintiff may recover nominal as well as punitive

damages *even if* a violation of his civil rights causes *no actual injury. Carey v. Piphus,* 435 U.S. 247 (1978); *Green v. McKaskle,* 788 F.2d 1116 (5th Cir. 1986); *Farrar v. Cain,* 756 F.2d 1148, 1152 (5th Cir. 1985); *Ustrak v. Fairman,* 781 F.2d 573, 581 (7th Cir. 1986); *Ganey v. Edwards,* 759 F.2d 337, 339 (4th Cir. 1985); *Madison County Jail Inmates v. Thompson,* 773 F.2d 834, 844 (7th Cir. 1985); *McCulloch v. Glasgow,* 620 F.2d 47 (5th Cir. 1980); *Mansell v. Saunders,* 372 F.2d 573 (5th Cir. 1967); *Brown v. Bullard Independent School District,* 640 F.2d 651 (5th Cir. 1981).

This rule should have been followed in the instant case. The officers' motive could not have been more evil; they did not receive the bribe they demanded so they fabricated evidence in order to obtain Petitioner's arrest and conviction. It is clear that Petitioner can show damages stemming from the officers' conduct. However, even if Petitioner was unable to show actual damages stemming from the officers' actions, this case clearly calls for an award of punitive damages under *Carey.*

CONCLUSION

For the above and foregoing reasons, Theodore Smith requests this Court to reverse the decision of the trial court below and to reverse the ruling by the Seventh Circuit which affirmed the trial court's decision.

Respectfully Submitted,

JULIE L. FRIEDMAN
53 West Jackson Boulevard
Suite 615
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 922-8980

Attorney for Petitioner-
THEODORE SMITH

APPENDIX

INDEX TO APPENDIX

Page

Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit - September 21, 1990 .....1a-10a

Order Denying Petition For Rehearing — November 16, 1990 .....11a

Cover Page and Page 15 of July 18, 1968 Probable Cause Hearing — Illinois Supreme Court Record 12a-13a

Cover Page and Excerpt from Pages 213-214 of May 18, 1970 Trial Transcript..... 14a-15a

Trial Court Order of February 13, 1989 .....16a

The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution ...17a

The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution 17

In the
United States Court of Appeals
For the Seventh Circuit

No. 89-1436

THEODORE SMITH,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO,
a Municipal Corporation,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.
No. 79 C 2038—**Nicholas J. Bua**, *Judge*.

ARGUED JANUARY 12, 1990—DECIDED SEPTEMBER 21, 1990

Before COFFEY, EASTERBROOK and MANION, *Circuit Judges*.

COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*. Theodore Smith appeals from a judgment in a civil rights action he brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 that limited him to recovery of nominal damages in the amount of $1 for an alleged unconstitutional arrest. The judgment was entered pursuant to a pre-trial agreement between Smith, the City of Chicago and individual defendants Jerry Springer, Richard O'Connell and Daniel Chilla, all officers or retired officers of the Chicago Police Department. The pre-trial agreement stipulated that Smith was to receive an award of $1 in

nominal damages from the City of Chicago. Further, the parties stipulated that there was no admission of liability on the part of the City or of the individual defendants, and Smith retained the right to file an appeal of the trial court's ruling on a motion *in limine* that had prevented him from seeking "relief for damages related to, or arising from, his criminal conviction," and had "limited [Smith] to seeking nominal damages."[1] We affirm.

I.

FACTS

This rape case arises from a woman's allegations that Theodore Smith sexually assaulted her on April 25, 1968. The woman reported the incident to the Chicago Police Department about 5 o'clock on that morning. According to a police report filed by two of the individual defendants, then Chicago Police Detectives O'Connell and Springer on May 26, 1968, the police officer who responded to the call was given a "service tag" the woman had obtained that listed Smith's name and the address where the rape allegedly occurred.[2] The officer took the woman to Billings Hospital where she was examined by a physician who, as was part of the examination, took a vaginal swab to ascertain the presence of semen, which proved negative.

According to his affidavit, defendant Daniel Chilla, then an evidence technician for the Chicago Police Department, stated that he was assigned to pick up the woman's vaginal swab sample from Billings Hospital on the morning of April 25, 1968. He further stated in his affidavit that he picked up the sample from an employee he noted at the time to be "R. Brown," although he had no present recollection of the employee's identity. However, Ralph Brown, an employee of the hospital, filed an affidavit stat-

[1] The agreement further provided that the City was to pay Smith's attorney $5,000 in attorneys' fees.

[2] The record does not explain the term "service tag."

ing that he did not give the vaginal swab of the rape victim to any Chicago police officer. Chilla's affidavit then states that he took the swab to the Chicago Police Department's Crime Laboratory. Joseph Price, a micro-analyst in the police laboratory, filed a report in the "Shirley Johnson Rape Investigation" dated April 26, 1968, that stated that he had received a "vaginal swab identified as having been taken from the victim at Billings Memorial Hospital," from Evidence Technician Chilla on April 26, 1968, and that "[m]icroscopic examinations of the [vaginal swab] revealed the presence of human spermatozoa . . . ."

On April 28, 1968, the victim went to a Chicago police station to view photographs of known sex offenders.[3] She identified a photograph of Theodore Smith as that of her attacker. The rape case was assigned to defendants Springer and O'Connell, Chicago police detectives, both of whom had prior contact with Smith. Smith asserts in an affidavit that he had paid these officers $110 as a bribe to fix a battery charge earlier in 1968. Smith also asserts that O'Connell and Springer confronted him on April 28, 1968, and told him that unless he paid the officers he would be arrested and charged with rape. Smith claims that he told Springer and O'Connell that he would not pay the bribe on May 7, 1968.[4]

---

[3] None of the named defendants are alleged to have been involved in the picture identification.

[4] Although Smith contends that these facts are asserted in an affidavit attached to a response to summary judgment filed earlier in the case, our examination of this affidavit only reveals Smith's assertions concerning the bribe paid to the officers concerning the battery charge and does not contain the facts relevant to the alleged bribery for a coverup of the rape charge. In addition, both Springer and O'Connell have filed affidavits denying any contact with Smith from the time they were assigned to the case until Smith's first court appearance on May 11, 1968. However, this factual discrepancy is not dispositive and, for purposes of this decision, we will accept Smith's allegations concerning the officers' attempt to solicit a bribe as true.

On May 8, 1968, the rape victim signed a sworn complaint for preliminary examination stating that Smith had raped her on April 25, 1968. Springer and O'Connell then took the rape victim before Judge Daniel J. Ryan of the Cook County Circuit Court and the victim told Ryan that Smith raped her. The judge issued a warrant dated May 8, 1968, for Smith's arrest on the rape charge.[5]

Smith was convicted of rape in a bench trial in Illinois state court. At trial the victim testified that Smith raped her, while Smith testified that there had been an agreement between the victim and himself for a paid sexual encounter, that he became afraid, and that no sexual activity resulted. When testimony had concluded, Smith's attorney and the state's attorney agreed to the admission of both the negative vaginal swab test for sperm performed at Billings Hospital as well as the positive test performed in the police laboratory. In finding Smith guilty of rape, the state court judge appeared to rely solely upon a judgment concerning the credibility of the testimony that had been given by the rape victim and by Smith, stating:

> "In reviewing all this I—while the defendant was on the stand—I'm sorry about what his problem was, but four or five different places, even though they may be called small, he gave me the impression that I just couldn't believe him.
>
> "As I read the rape cases, it is easy to challenge and hard to prove and hard to defend against but immediately after leaving the place, she had a conversation with a roommate. Police came. They came to the same building. She saw pictures. Pointed him out. That was the man. Even though he was arrested some 12 or 13 days later.
>
> "I can see no reason why the young lady would say these things. I can see why he would say he didn't, because he's the defendant.

---

[5] Smith was arrested by an Officer Reed who has not been named as a defendant.

> "Because of the discrepancies that I marked down, whether he was confused or not, I don't know about when he went to work, about when he went to the tavern, the difference in the amounts of money he offered her, the threatening, if there was the threatening, four or five difference discrepancies in his testimony—the other gentleman that testified for him admitted he heard nothing, didn't see anything except them walking down the street. Didn't know anything. Didn't hear what was said.
>
> "So, I think for those reasons there will be a finding of guilty. There will be a judgment on the finding."

In reaching his finding the judge mentioned neither the presence of sperm found in the police laboratory report nor the absence of sperm in the hospital laboratory report. Smith unsuccessfully challenged his convictions on direct appeal and in both state and federal habeas corpus proceedings.

After Smith was released from prison, he filed this suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 asserting that Springer, O'Connell and Chilla deprived him of his constitutional right to due process. Smith believed that the positive laboratory report concerning the presence of semen that the police had performed was fabricated because the police had not received a genuine vaginal swab of the rape victim. Smith based this belief initially upon his position that there was no employee of Billings Hospital in 1968 with the name of R. Brown and later upon his discovery that while there was such an employee, that employee did not furnish the vaginal swab sample to the Chicago Police Department.[6] The district court originally dismissed Smith's action on

---

[6] Smith furnished the court with an affidavit of Ralph M. Brown that stated that a "policeman of the Chicago Police Department, to the best of my knowledge did not pick-up a test tub [sic] and a smear, taken by Dr. Young Rok Kim from the allege [sic] rape victim . . . from me at the University of Chicago Hospital and clinics."

the ground that it was an improper attempt to utilize 42 U.S.C. § 1983 to collaterally attack a state court conviction. However, we reversed that conclusion in *Smith v. Springer*, 859 F.2d 31, 34 (7th Cir. 1988), holding:

> "The defendants apparently read this complaint as stating that Smith can only prevail on his section 1983 claim if his conviction is invalid. This is not necessarily so. Smith need not legally attack the validity of his conviction to prevail on his section 1983 claim if he can prove that the defendant's misconduct injured him. The causation element of section 1983 requires only that the plaintiff prove that the defendant, acting 'under color' of law, caused the deprivation of his constitutional rights. 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Smith, therefore, can prevail if he shows that the defendants fabricated evidence leading to his false arrest and subsequent unreasonable seizure, *see, e.g., Olson v. Tyler*, 825 F.2d 1116 (7th Cir. 1987); *Bohannon v. Pegelow*, 652 F.2d 729 (7th Cir. 1981) causing him to suffer damages."

We remanded Smith's case for further proceedings consistent with our opinion. *Id.* at 36.

After the case was remanded, the defendants filed a motion *in limine* seeking to bar recovery of "damages related to [Smith's] conviction and incarceration." As reflected in Smith's trial brief that was made part of the district court's pre-trial order, Smith believed that he was "entitled to compensatory damages for each day he was confined in the penitentiary as well as for lost earning opportunities caused by his felony conviction." The trial court granted the motion *in limine* holding that: "Plaintiff may not seek relief for damages related to, or arising from, his criminal conviction, and is limited to seeking nominal damages."

In light of the court's limitation on the damages Smith could be awarded, Smith, the individual defendants and the City of Chicago entered into an agreement that, without admission of fault on the part of the City or the individual defendants, judgment would be entered against the

City for nominal damages in the amount of $1. The City would also pay Smith's attorney fees in the amount of $5,000. Under the agreement, however, Smith maintained the right to appeal from the district court's order on the motion *in limine*, and the parties stipulated that if his appeal was successful, the individual defendants and the City could contest their liability in further proceedings in district court. The trial court entered a judgment order reflecting the parties' agreement and substituting the City of Chicago for the individual police officers as the defendant in this case.

II.

LIMITATION OF RECOVERY TO NOMINAL DAMAGES

Smith's appeal focuses on the propriety of the trial court's ruling on the City's motion *in limine* that precluded Smith from receiving damages related to his incarceration and loss of employment opportunities as a result of his criminal conviction and that limited Smith to nominal damages. Because any amount of recovery of compensatory damages would necessarily be in addition to the $1 in nominal damages that Smith received, the Court's determination that Smith could be awarded only nominal damages precludes any award of compensatory damages. Thus, we will turn initially to the potentially dispositive issue of whether the trial court properly limited Smith's recovery to nominal damages.

As we held in a previous decision in this matter, "Smith . . . can prevail if he shows that the defendants fabricated evidence leading to his false arrest and subsequent unreasonable seizure causing him to suffer damages." *Smith*, 859 F.2d at 34 (citations omitted). Thus, in order for Smith to recover compensatory damages, he must demonstrate that he suffered damages as a result of a constitutionally improper arrest.

In *Carey v. Piphus*, 435 U.S. 247, 260 (1978), the Supreme Court held that a constitutional deprivation would

not allow the recovery of compensatory damages if the injured party could or would have suffered the same injury even if the alleged constitutional violation had not occurred. The Court held:

> "In this case, the Court of Appeals held that if petitioners can prove on remand that '[respondents] would have been suspended even if a proper hearing had been held,' 545 F.2d, at 32, then respondents will not be entitled to recover damages to compensate them for injuries caused by the suspensions. The court thought that in such a case, the failure to accord procedural due process could not properly be viewed as the cause of the suspensions. The court suggested that in such circumstances, an award of damages for injuries caused by the suspensions would constitute a windfall, rather than compensation, to respondents. We do not understand the parties to disagree with this conclusion. Nor do we."

435 U.S. at 260 (citations and footnote omitted). Although compensatory damages could not be recovered for a constitutional violation, absent a demonstration of actual injury resulting from the constitutional violation, an award of nominal damages would still be appropriate:

> "Because the right to procedural due process is 'absolute' in the sense that it does not depend upon the merits of a claimant's substantive assertions, and because of the importance to organized society that procedural due process be observed, we believe that the denial of procedural due process should be actionable for nominal damages without proof of actual injury. We therefore hold that if, upon remand, the District Court determines that respondents' suspensions were justified, respondents nevertheless will be entitled to recover nominal damages not to exceed one dollar from petitioners."

Carey, 435 U.S. at 266-67 (citations and footnotes omitted).

In order to recover more than nominal damages, Smith must demonstrate that the fabricated evidence resulted

in an absence of probable cause for his arrest, meaning that he would not have been lawfully arrested in the absence of the fabricated evidence. Indeed, we have gone so far as to hold that there is not even a constitutional violation when there is a basis for a conclusion that probable cause supports a person's arrest:

> "Schertz's claim—that the investigating officers harbored malicious motives toward him—does not address an issue material to the disposition of this case. Regardless of the defendant's motives toward the plaintiff, the existence of probable cause for arrest is an absolute bar to a Section 1983 claim for unlawful arrest, false imprisonment, or malicious prosecution. If, however, the finding of probable cause is based on the defendant's intentional misrepresentation or concealment of material facts, the plaintiff may be able to proceed on a Fourth Amendment claim challenging the reasonableness of an arrest. In this case Schertz does not claim that the defendants concealed or misrepresented facts actually known to them; therefore the existence of probable cause bars plaintiff's Section 1983 claim."

Schertz v. Waupaca County, 875 F.2d 578, 582 (7th Cir. 1989) (citations omitted). *See also Olson v. Tyler*, 825 F.2d 1116, 1117 (7th Cir. 1987) ("In general, if probable cause supports an arrest warrant, an arrest pursuant to that warrant is valid even if events later prove the charges inaccurate . . . ."); *Mark v. Furay*, 769 F.2d 1266, 1268-69 ("This court has consistently held that the existence of probable cause for an arrest totally precludes any section 1983 claim for unlawful arrest, false imprisonment, or malicious prosecution, regardless of whether the defendant had malicious motives for arresting the plaintiff.").

Several factors in this case clearly establish probable cause. Initially the rape victim identified Smith from an array of photographs as the man who sexually assaulted her. The victim signed a sworn complaint alleging that Smith had raped her. Further, the victim also appeared in person before the judge and stated that Smith had raped

her. A warrant for Smith's arrest for the rape was issued and thereafter Smith was arrested. The combination of the victim's photo identification of Smith, her sworn complaint and her statement to the judge that Smith raped her certainly provide the probable cause necessary to justify Smith's arrest. Because the rape victim's identification of Smith as her attacker and her declarations in the criminal complaint clearly supported a probable cause determination, we are convinced that Smith would have been lawfully arrested for sexual assault even if the defendants had been involved in the falsification of the police laboratory report regarding the presence of sperm. Thus, because probable cause existed for Smith's arrest and he would, thus, have been arrested in the absence of the defendants' alleged unconstitutional conduct, Smith has failed to suffer actual damages from the asserted constitutional deprivation, and his recovery was properly limited to nominal damages. The judgment of the district court is

AFFIRMED.

A true Copy:

Teste:

Clerk of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

USCA 79004—Midwest Law Printing Co., Inc., Chicago—9-21-90—500

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

November 16, 1990

Before

Hon. JOHN L. COFFEY, Circuit Judge
Hon. FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, Circuit Judge
Hon. DANIEL A. MANION, Circuit Judge

THEODORE SMITH,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

No. 89-1436 v.

CITY OF CHICAGO,
a Municipal Corporation,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 79 C 2038

Nicholas J. Bua,
Judge

ORDER

On consideration of the petition for rehearing and suggestion for rehearing *en banc* filed in the above-entitled cause by plaintiff-appellant, no judge in active service has requested a vote thereon, and all of the judges on the original panel have voted to deny a rehearing. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the aforesaid petition for rehearing be, and the same is hereby, DENIED.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
COUNTY OF COOK SS:

THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF CHICAGO
First Municipal District
of
THE CIRCUIT COURT, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

THE PEOPLE OF THE
STATE OF ILLINOIS
Plaintiff,

No. 68 MC CC 989984

vs.
THEODORE SMITH,
Defendant.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had at the hearing of the above-entitled cause before the Honorable DANIEL J. RYAN, Judge of said Court, this 18th day of July, A.D., 1968.

APPEARANCES:

HON. JOHN J. STAMOS,
State's Attorney, by
MR. JOHN EGAN,
Assistant State's Attorney,

appeared for the Plaintiff,

MR. DEFENSE COUNSEL,

appeared for the Defendant, Theodore Smith.

MR. DEFENSE COUNSEL: It doesn't come close to four hours.

THE COURT: I think she saw the man and one time was in the room, plus sperm and the immediate complaint and certain conditions. What do you know about this?

MR. EGAN: The officer had a conversation with the same witness that he offered to bring in.

POLICE OFFICER: I talked to him, if he heard any disturbance, he said, "No." I questioned him as to Theodore Smith and his words to me were that he's a nut, they've been trying to get rid of him in the building.

MR. EGAN: What was the result of the medical?

POLICE OFFICER: There was sperm.

THE COURT: There's no question about it. Normally, they're out together, but here's an accosted woman on the street, she never knew him before.

MR. DEFENSE COUNSEL: Your Honor, may I –

THE COURT: I'll hold it over. You could save your defense for later. The same bond to stand.

MR. EGAN: Counsel, keep him away from her.

STATE OF ILLINOIS

ss:

COUNTY OF COOK

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY
COUNTY DEPARTMENT—CRIMINAL DIVISION

THE PEOPLE OF THE
STATE OF ILLINOIS

Vs

Indictment No:
Charge: Rape

THEODORE SMITH

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had in the above-entitled cause before the HONORABLE KENNETH R. WENDT, Judge of the said Court, on Monday, the 18th day of May A.D., 1970, 2:00 o'clock P.M.

APPEARANCES:

Same as before.

Q She didn't commit an act of oral copulation on you?

A I don't understand you.

Q She didn't put her mouth on your penis.

A No.

MR. SAVAGE: That's all.

THE COURT: Anything else?

RECROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. BOBACK:

Q But that's what you were paying the $19 for.

A For what?

Q Oral copulation and sexual intercourse.

A No, sir.

Q Nothing?

A No sir.

MR. BOBACK: That's all.

THE COURT: Call your next, Mr. Savage.

MR. SAVAGE: The defendant, your Honor, will not call any further witnesses.

THE COURT: You what, sir?

MR. SAVAGE: The defendant will not call any further witnesses. I would like, however, at this time to offer into evidence pursuant to stipulation of the State's Attorny, photographic copy of medical reports of the University of Chicago Hospital and Clinic relating to Shirley Johnson and indicating on one page thereof that she was examined by a Doctor Young Rok Kim at 5:00 in the morning of April 25, 1968; that he ran tests and smears of her pelvic regions among other things, discovered that her external genitalia was normal, and there was negative any bruises or any trauma of any kind; that her vagina was clean and that the vaginal smear that — that he gave her proved negative for any spermatozoa.

I'd like, if I may, to have this marked as Defendant's Exhibit 1.

(Whereupon, the item was marked DX1 I.D.)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

THEODORE SMITH,
Plaintiff,

vs.

No. 79 C 2038
(JUDGE BUA)

JERRY SPRINGER, et al.,
Defendant.

O R D E R

THIS MATTER coming before the Court on Defendants' Motion in Limine Regarding Plaintiff's Claim for Damages Related to His Criminal Conviction, the Court having considered the memoranda submitted by counsel.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

(1) Defendants' Motion in Limine is granted.

(2) Plaintiff may not seek relief for damages related to, or arising from, his criminal conviction, and is limited to seeking nominal damages.

ENTER: /s/ NICHOLAS J. BUA
NICHOLAS J. BUA
Judge, United States District Court

DATED: February 13, 1989

AMENDMENT IV—SEARCHES AND SEIZURES

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.